

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1-12 and 17-21 are currently pending. Claims 13-15 were previously canceled. Claim 16 is withdrawn. Claims 5 and 11 have been amended. No new matter is added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, due to a lack of antecedent basis for the element “said storing means.” However, in light of the amendment to claim 5 submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been traversed and requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10, 17, 18, 20, and 21

Claims 1-10, 17, 18, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kobayaghi et al. (USP 6,950,852) in view of Ohkado et al. (US 2001/0016873). However, for at least the reasons presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been traversed and requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 1 is directed to a system that enables real-time web sharing of a web page being viewed on a plurality of terminals, the system including a server and one or more terminals. The server includes means to transmit a detecting script and an updating script, and a means to transmit update information, from a prescribed terminal to another terminal that is displaying the same web page as the prescribed terminal. The terminals are provided with receiving means to receive the detecting script and the updating script sent from the server and to generate and transmit update information to the server. The terminals are also provided with means to update the web page being displayed on the terminal based on received update information. The system of claim 1 uses a single server, which transmits the detecting scripts and updating scripts directly to the terminals that display the web page and to receive update information from the terminals, and transmits the detecting and updating scripts directly to the terminals.

In contrast, the system of Kobayaghi et al. uses a collaboration server including a “CachinManager” to accumulate pages sent from a web server and modifies the pages with scripts. The collaboration server then saves copies of the modified pages on an internal web server (‘httpd’ in Fig. 2). See Kobayaghi et al. at col. 2, lines 2-11, 33-40. The modified web pages are then sent to users’ browsers to be displayed.

The system of Ohkado et al. employs a similar mechanism, using cache manager 115, which is part of collaboration server 110, to embed applets and scripts into web pages outside of the customer’s browser 130. See Ohkado et al. at para. 0116, Fig. 3.

Thus, the combination of Kobayaghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. does not teach or suggest a system which includes, among other elements, “a server provided with a means to transmit a detecting script ... and an updating script” to a terminal, as in claim 1. Instead, the combination of these references teaches a system that includes a collaboration server that accumulates web pages from a first web server, modifies the web pages with scripts, and saves the web pages on a second web server that is part of the collaboration server and is separate from the first web server that initially produced the pages. Compared to the system of claim 1, the system taught by the combination of Kobayaghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. includes several additional components and steps and thus would be expected to respond less quickly than the claimed system.

Claim 7 is directed to a terminal of a real-time web sharing system which enables real-time sharing of a web page via a remote server and which includes, among other features, “a means to receive a detecting script which detects an update to the web page, an updating script which updates the web page, and update information which notifies the update to the web page, all of these scripts being sent from a server.”

As discussed above, the combination of Kobayaghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. teaches a system that includes a collaboration server, which accumulates web pages from a first web server, modifies the web pages with scripts, and saves the web pages on a second web server that is part of the collaboration server and is separate from the first web server that initially produced the pages. Thus, the system taught by the combination of Kobayaghi et al. in view of Ohkado et

al. does not teach a terminal as in claim 7 which includes “means to receive a detecting script which detects an update to the web page” or to receive “an updating script which updates the web page.” Instead, in the system of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. the scripts are not sent to the terminal but instead the collaboration server obtains web pages from a first web server, embeds scripts into the web pages, stores the modified pages on a second web server that is part of the collaboration server, and then distributes the modified web pages to the users’ web browsers.

Claim 17 is directed to a method of sharing in real-time a web page being displayed on a first terminal and a second terminal via a remote server, which includes, among other steps, “said server transmitting to the first terminal a detecting script which detects an update to a web page and transmitting to said second terminal an updating script which updates a web page; said first terminal receiving the detecting script sent from said server and causing this received detecting script to detect an update to a web page; said second terminal receiving the updating script sent from said server.”

As discussed above, the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. teaches a system that includes a collaboration server, which accumulates web pages from a first web server, modifies the web pages with scripts, and saves the web pages on a second web server that is part of the collaboration server and is separate from the first web server that initially produced the pages. The modified pages are then distributed to the users’ web browsers. Thus, the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. does not teach or suggest a method according to claim 17, as the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. does not teach or suggest a server “transmitting to the first terminal a detecting script which detects an update to a web page and transmitting to said second terminal an updating script which updates a web page,” a terminal “receiving the detecting script sent from said server and causing this received detecting script to detect an update to a web page,” or a second terminal “receiving the updating script sent from said server,” among other elements.

Thus, as the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 1, 7, or 17, these claims are not obvious in view of this combination and are thus allowable. For at least this reason and because each recites additional patentable subject matter, the remaining claims are allowable because each depends from an allowable independent claim.

Claims 11 and 12

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ohkado et al. in view of Kobayaghi et al. However, for at least the reasons presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been traversed and requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 11 as amended is directed to a server of a system that enables sharing of a web page being viewed between a plurality of terminals in real-time. The server includes, among other features, “a means to transmit to a terminal a detecting script which detects an update to the web page and an updating script which updates the web page.”

As discussed above, the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. teaches a system including a server (the collaboration server) which accumulates web pages from a first web server, modifies the web pages with scripts, and saves the web pages on a second web server that is part of the collaboration server and is separate from the first web server that initially produced the pages. The modified pages are then distributed to the users’ web browsers. Thus, the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. does not teach or suggest a server according to claim 11 which includes, among other features, “a means to transmit to a terminal a detecting script which detects an update to the web page and an updating script which updates the web page.”

Thus, as the combination of Ohkado et al. in view of Kobayaghi et al. does not teach or suggest the elements of claim 11, claim 11 is not obvious in view of this combination and is thus allowable. Claim 12 is allowable because it depends from allowable independent claim 11 and because it recites additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 19

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kobayaghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. further in view of Kim et al. (US 2003/0105819). However, for at least the reasons presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been traversed and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 19 is allowable because it depends from an allowable independent claim and because it recites additional patentable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented herein, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. The Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned at the phone number below should any issues remain with respect to the application.

No other fees are believed due in connection with this submission. However, if additional fees are owed, please charge Deposit Account 50-1965.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP

/thomas j. keating/

By: _____
Thomas J. Keating, Reg. No. 59,110
Tel.: 608-257-3501

Dated: May 27, 2009

Docket: 202064-9001 US00

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
Two Prudential Plaza
180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312.222.0800